PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

LLOYD K GARRISON (1946-1991) RANDOLPH E, PAUL (1946-1956) SIMON H RIFKIND (1950-1995) LOUIS S, WEISS (1927-1950) JOHN F, WHARTON (1927-1977)

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

212-373-3543

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

212-492-0543

WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS

agordon@paulweiss.com

UNIT 3601, OFFICE TOWER A, BEIJING FORTUNE PLAZA NO. 7 DONGSANHUAN ZHONGLU CHAOYANG DISTRICT BEIJING 100020 PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TELEPHONE (66-10) 5828-6300

> 12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING 3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

> > ALDER CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EC2V 7JU, U.K. TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (61-3) 3597-6101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE 77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100 PO. BOX 226 TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3 TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

> 2001 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047 TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

SOO DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410



ROBERTA A. KAPLAN BRAD S. KARP PATRICK N. KARSNITZ JOHN C. KENNEDY BRIAN KIM ALANEY. KENNEDRO DANIEL J. KENNEDY DANIEL J. KENNERP DAVID K. LAKHDHIR STEPHEN P LAMB" JOHN E. LANGE DANIEL J. LEFFELL XIATOU GREGALUL J. LEFFELL XIATOU GREGALUL JARCO V. MASOTELL DAVID W. MAYO ELIZABETH R. MGCOLM MARK F. MENDELSOHN WAYN E. MENDELSOHN WAYN E. MENDELSOHN WARK F. MENDELSOHN WALTER C. P. KANNET VALLEFE C. P. K. MENDER GARL L. REISNER WALTER G. RICCIARDI WALTER G. RICCIARDI WALTER G. RICCIARDI WALTER G. RICCIARDI WALTER B. SCHWEITS DALE M. SARNO LSOHNEN R. SCHWEIDER GLEJABETH M. SCHNEIDER GARL M. SARNO SCHWEN SINKIN STEVEN SIMKIN STEVEN SIMKIN SJUDTA J. SONOVAS TARUN M. STEWART ERIC ALAN STONE ANDREW M. SOLNEDER MANNET SIMMINS JAUDRA J. SONOVAS SCOTT M. SONTAG TARUN M. STEWART ERICALAN STONE ARANSYNNYTFSKY MONICA K. THURMOND DANIEL J. TOAL LIZA M. VELAZOUEZ MARIA T. VULLO ALSYMENCE C. WEES THEODORE V. WELS. JR. BETH A. WILLIAMS STEVEN J. WILLIAMS LAWRENCE C. WILLIAMS LAWRENCE C. WILLIAMS STEVEN J. WILLIAMS STEVEN J. WILLIAMS STEVEN J. WILLIAMS LAWRENCE C. WILLIAMS STEVEN J. WILLIAMS STEVEN WILLIAMS STEVEN J. W

		BRIAN M. JANSON JAREN JANGHORBANI MEREDITH J. KANE	TRACEY A. ZACCONE TRACEY A. ZACCONE TAURIE M. ZEITZER T. ROBERT ZOCHOWSKI, JR.
By Hand	USDC SDIVI DOCUMENT		
The Honorable Victor Marre United States District Judge			NOV n 5 2015
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse		15	JULEE MARRERO
500 Pearl St.	State transfer and a state sta		

Anwar, et al. v. Fairfield Greenwich Limited, et al., No. 09-cv-118 (S.D.N.Y.) (VM) (FM)

Dear Judge Marrero:

New York, NY 10007-1312

November 4, 2015

We represent the Citco Defendants in the above action. As directed by the Court, we respectfully submit this letter in response to the October 30, 2015 letter submitted by advisors to and representatives of certain investors (the "Deminor Investors") in the Fairfield Sentry Ltd., Fairfield Sigma Ltd. and Fairfield Lambda Ltd. funds.

In their letter to the Court, the Deminor Investors purport to offer their "serious concerns and reserves" about the proposed settlement between plaintiffs and the Citco Defendants. As we explain below, the Deminor Investors' supposed concerns and reserves should be rejected as procedurally improper and substantively meritless.

The Honorable Victor Marrero

The Deminor Investors' Letter Is Procedurally Improper

As an initial matter, the Deminor Investors' letter is patently improper and should be disregarded. The Deminor Investors acknowledge that they have filed timely requests to be excluded from the proposed settlement. They concede, as they must, that they are, as a result, precluded from objecting to the settlement. *See Reid* v. *SuperShuttle Int'l, Inc.*, No. 08 Civ. 4854 (JG)(VVP), 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 113117, at *6 n.1 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2012) ("Some of the class members who have opted out filed letters with the Court objecting in general terms to the settlement. However, by opting out, these class members relinquished their standing to formally object to the settlement."); *In re Warner Comm. Sec. Litig.*, 618 F. Supp. 735, 753 (S.D.N.Y. 1985) (dismissing purported objections from two opt-outs who objected to a proposed settlement because the individuals were no longer class members and thus lacked "standing to challenge the settlement"), *aff'd*, 798 F.2d 35 (2d Cir. 1986).

The Deminor Investors purport to state "concerns and reserves" about the settlement, arguing that the settlement supposedly does not provide "fair, reasonable and adequate compensation." Such an argument, however, is a quintessential *objection* to the terms of a proposed class action settlement. As the case law cited above makes clear, the Deminor Investors have no standing to assert such an objection, or any other objection for that matter. Their purported objections should be rejected on this ground alone.

The Deminor Investors' letter, in fact, makes clear the very reasons for the rule barring opt-outs from objecting to class action settlements. Their letter was submitted by two lawyers affiliated with Deminor Recovery Services, a firm that is part of a Luxembourg-based group of companies and that bills itself as an "originator" and "manager" of "actions on behalf of private and institutional investors."¹ The obvious purpose of their letter is either to secure additional clients from the class or to scuttle the proposed settlement, or both. The former interest is not an appropriate basis for an objection, and the latter is an improper effort to interfere with a settlement in which the Deminor Investors are not participating.

Further, any concerns on the part of the Deminor Investors that approval of the proposed settlement could somehow interfere with the claims they acknowledge they are pursuing against certain Citco entities in the Netherlands should be given no weight. Those claims arise out of precisely the same circumstances that gave rise to this matter and seek compensation for both their own and the relevant funds' alleged losses. The Deminor Investors, however, cannot plausibly complain that the settlement in this matter could somehow deny them recovery in their Dutch lawsuit. To be clear, Citco intends to vigorously defend itself against those claims and is confident that its strong factual and legal defenses will prevail. In the meantime, the Deminor Investors are free to pursue their claims irrespective of the outcome of this matter.

See Deminor Recovery Services, Recovery of investment losses, http://www.deminor.com/drs/en/services/recovery-of-losses (last visited Nov. 4, 2015).

The Honorable Victor Marrero

In Any Event, The Deminor Investors' Objections Are Meritless

Even if the Deminor Investors' objections to the settlement were considered (and they should not be), they should be rejected on the merits because the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

To begin with, the Deminor Investors' view of the proposed settlement which was the recommended settlement amount proposed by a highly regarded mediator after several mediation sessions—evidently is not shared by the vast majority of other class members. The Deminor Investors claim to have aggregate "Net Losses" of approximately \$155 million. That, however, is less than *five percent* of the damages claimed by plaintiffs in this matter. Significantly, the vast majority of the other class members—those representing more than 95% of plaintiffs' claimed damages—apparently agree that the settlement *is* fair, reasonable, and adequate.

Any class member who wished to opt out of the settlement had to do so by October 16. As of that date, to the best of our knowledge only *two* class members unaffiliated with the Deminor Investors had filed out-out notices. One of those opt-outs had a Net Loss of only \$1.5 million—amounting to only 0.05% percent of plaintiffs' claimed losses—while the other opt-out was a net winner and thus had no claim. As of today, both of those opt-outs have withdrawn their requests to be excluded from the class. Accordingly, to the best of our knowledge not a single class member other than the Deminor Investors has opted out of the class. The Deminor Investors' view of the proposed settlement thus stands in marked contrast to the views of other class members, who have chosen overwhelmingly to participate in the settlement.

Further, the only supposed support the Deminor Investors offer for their argument that the settlement is supposedly unfair is the fact that class members will receive, at a minimum, 2.5% of their Net Losses in the settlement. But, as the Deminor Investors acknowledge, plaintiffs have shown, based on research from Cornerstone Research, that "median settlements as a percentage of 'estimated damages' for 2014 was 2.2% and ranged for 2005 through 2014 between a high of 3.1% to a low of 1.8%." (ECF No. 1423 ¶ 87.) The Deminor Investors cannot rebut that showing by relying on nothing more than their own *ipse dixit* that a 2.5% recovery is insufficient "based on the specificities of this particular case"—"specificities" they do not even identify.

If anything, the "specificities of this particular case" confirm that the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. As demonstrated in the Citco Defendants' briefing in both this Court and the Second Circuit, and as explained by plaintiffs in their motion for approval of the settlement (*see* ECF No. 1423 ¶¶ 9-10), plaintiffs face numerous factual and legal obstacles to any recovery on their claims against the Citco Defendants. The Citco Defendants firmly believe that they would prevail if this matter proceeded to trial. Moreover, even if plaintiffs prevailed on their claims, any recovery would likely be years in the future. Under these circumstances, the

The Honorable Victor Marrero

recovery class members will receive under the settlement is eminently fair, particularly when compared with recoveries in other class action settlements in this District.

In sum, the Deminor Investors' objections, even if this Court chooses to consider them (and it should not), should not stand in the way of the proposed settlement in this matter.

Respectfully, andraw Gordon / jem

Andrew Gordon

cc: (via email)

Charles Demoulin Joeri Klein David A. Barrett Stuart H. Singer Victor E. Stewart Robert C. Finkel Sarah L. Cave Timothy A. Duffy

	s directed to enter into the public record er above submitted to the Court by
The Citco	Defendants.
SO ORDERED.	172
11-6-15	VICTOR MARRERO, U.S.D.J.
DATE	VICTOR MARRERO, U.S.D.J.